

1896

1896

THE  
JOURNAL  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND  
FOR  
1896.



PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY,  
22, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

MDCCCXCVI.

	PAGE
ART. XIV.—Note on Udyāna and Gandhāra. By H. A. DEANE .....	655
ART. XV.—The Liturgy of the Nile. By the Rev. G. MARGOLIOUTH, M.R.A.S. ....	677
ART. XVI.—Al-Abrīk, Tephrikē, the Capital of the Paulicians. By GUY LE STRANGE .....	733
ART. XVII.—Notes on Akbar's Súbahs, with reference to the <i>A'in-i Akbari</i> . No. II: Orissa. By JOHN BEAMES, B.C.S. (ret.) .....	743
ART. XVIII.—An Apocryphal Inscription in Khorāsān. By NEY ELIAS, M.R.A.S. ....	767
ART. XIX.—Note on the Panjmana Inscription sent by Mr. Ney Elias. By H. BEVERIDGE, M.R.A.S. ..	781
ART. XX.—An inscription of Madanapāladeva of Kanauj. By C. BENDALL .....	787
ART. XXI.—On a system of Letter-numerals used in South India. By C. BENDALL .....	789
 CORRESPONDENCE.	
1. "Shah Daulah's Rats." By W. H. D. ROUSE ..	793
2. "Antiquity of Eastern Falconry." By W. F. SINCLAIR .....	793
 NOTES OF THE QUARTER.	
I. Contents of Foreign Oriental Journals .....	797
II. NOTES AND NEWS .....	798
 III. NOTICES OF BOOKS—	
Captain P. R. GURDON, I.S.C. Some Assamese Proverbs. Reviewed by R. N. CUST .....	807
R. SEWELL & S. B. DĪKSHIT, and Dr. R. SCHRAM. The Indian Calendar, with tables. By F. KIELHORN .....	809
Professor HILPRECHT. The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. By T. G. P. ....	818

ART. XVI. — *Al-Abriḳ, Tephrikē, the Capital of the Paulicians: a correction corrected.* By GUY LE STRANGE.

IT is, I hope, never too late to acknowledge a mistake and correct a blunder. Since the appearance of my note on the Castle of Abriḳ (see J.R.A.S. for October, 1895, p. 739), Professor De Goeje has called my attention to a passage in the "Tanbih" of Mas'ūdi, which negatives the identification of Abriḳ with the modern Arabkir, and proves incontrovertibly that Tephrikē, of which there can be little doubt that Divrigi (or Divrik) is the present representative, must be the place which various Arab geographers describe under the name aforesaid of Abriḳ or Abrūk.

In the "Decline and Fall," chapter liv, Gibbon gives an interesting account of the Paulicians (so called after one Paul, their founder), a curious sect of Eastern Christians, whose Manichæan beliefs caused them to be ruthlessly persecuted by the orthodox emperors of Constantinople. In the latter part of the ninth century A.D., Carbeas, whose father had been impaled as a heretic by the Catholic inquisitors, led the revolt of the Paulicians. He founded and fortified the city of Tephrikē, and, aided by the armies of the Caliph, utterly routed the Emperor Michael under the walls of Samosata. His successor, Chrysocheir, over-ran and plundered the whole of Asia Minor, but was finally defeated and slain by the troops sent against him by the Emperor Basil. "With Chrysocheir, the glory of the Paulicians faded and withered; on the second expedition of the Emperor, the impregnable Tephrikē was deserted by the heretics, who sued for mercy and escaped to the borders." This is the account given by Gibbon on the authority of the Byzantine Chroniclers, and, as will be seen,

it agrees perfectly with the following passages from nearly contemporary Arab authorities—Mas'ūdi, who wrote in 943 A.D., and Ẹudāma, *circa* 880 A.D.

I should begin by stating that the name of the Paulicians occurs in the Arabic under the form of *Baylakāni*, which is the nearest available rendering of the Greek word *Παυλικιάνοι* (the Arabs having no P), and that the plural of *Baylakāni* is *Baylaka*, a form which less clearly recalls the Greek original.

The heresy of Paul of Samosata is mentioned by Shahrastāni in his "History of Sects and Philosophical Schools" (see vol. i, pp. 262 and 266 of the translation by T. Haarbrücker); but there appears to be some confusion here between the reputed founder of the Paulicians and his namesake, the Patriarch of Antioch, a celebrated Monarchian heresiarch, who troubled the Church in more ways than one during the third century of the Christian era. This confusion, however, is unimportant to the matter now under discussion, which deals solely with the events of the ninth century after Christ, when, as a matter of historical geography, it becomes important to establish the identity between the Arab "AbriḲ" and the Greek "Tephrikē": and this identification is proved by the following.

Mas'ūdi, in his "Tanbih" (p. 151), while enumerating the various Christian sects, mentions that of the Baylakāni, which "is the sect instituted by Paulus of Shimshāt [read Sumaysāt, or Samosata], who originally had been Patriarch of Antioch." Mas'ūdi, later on in the same work (p. 183), when speaking of the various fortresses which, after having once been in Moslem hands, had now come to be reconquered by the Greeks, makes mention of Malatīyya, Shimshāt, Hisn-Manṣūr, "and the Castle of AbriḲ, which was the capital of the Baylakāni, where lived many of their Patriarchs [or Patricians], such as Ẹarbiyās [Carbeas], the Client of the family of Ṭāhīr-ibn-al-Ḥusayn, also Kharsakhāris [Chrysocheir], and besides these two some others."

The same author, in his "Golden Meadows" (viii, 74), further relates that a certain Greek, who had by conversion become a good Moslem, gave him (Mas'ūdi) a full account of Constantinople, adding that there was in that city a church where were kept ten statues representing persons celebrated among the Christians for their valour and wisdom: "of these is *Ḳarbiyās* the *Baylaḳāni*, Lord of the City of *Abriḳ*, which at the present day belongs to the Greeks, and he was Patrician [or Patriarch] of these *Baylaḳāni*, his death having taken place in the year 249 [A.D. 863]. There is also here the statue of *Kharsakhāris*, who was the sister [the MSS. here are corrupt; we should perhaps read "successor"] of *Ḳarbiyās*. . . . Now mention has been made elsewhere of the sect of the *Baylaḳāni* and of their beliefs, and they are a sect part Christian, part Magian, but at this present time [A.H. 332, A.D. 943] they have migrated, and now live among the nation of the Greeks."

Another contemporary author who mentions the Paulicians is *Ḳudāma*, who, naming the Greek provinces ("Book on the Revenues," p. 254) which lie over against the territory of *Malatīyya* (Melitene), mentions the districts of *Kharshana* and *Khāldaya*, that is the Charsianian and the Chaldian Themes. It may be noted in passing that there seems to be much confusion as to the identification of the site of *Kharshana*. *Ibn Khurdadbih*, in his "Road Book" (p. 108), writes: "The *Kharsiyūn* District is near the *Darb* [pass or high-road] of *Malatīyya*. In this district lies the fortress of *Kharshana*, together with four others"; and conformably with this, in my paper on *Ibn Serapion* (p. 747), I have, on the authority of Mr. Hogarth, identified *Kharshana* with the present village of *Alaja Khan* lying on the upper waters of the *Kuru Tchay*, the older *Jarjariya*. It appears, however, from Professor Ramsay's "Historical Geography" (p. 249 and elsewhere) that Charsianon Castron, the original of the Arab *Kharshana*, is to be sought, not at the village of *Alaja Khan*, but at *Alaja*, an important road-centre to the west

of the upper Halys, and this Alaja was the ancient Karissa or Garsi. From Alaja Khan to Alaja there is a distance, as the crow flies, of over 150 miles, and they must not therefore be confounded.

To return, however, to the Paulicians, Ḳudāma (already quoted) states in his "Book on the Revenues" (p. 254) that between Malatiyya, Kharshana, Khāldaya, and the Armenian country is "the land which was settled by a people called the Baylakāni, who are of the Greeks, except for certain differences that exist between the two in matters of faith. These people used to give aid to the Moslems during their raids [into the Greek country], and their aid was greatly valued by the Moslems. All at once, however, they migrated away from this land, in consequence of the evil conduct of the governors of the [Moslem] frontier who had dealings with them, and of the little honour that they received at the hands of those appointed to look after their affairs [by the Caliph]. Hence the Paulicians have come to be dispersed abroad throughout the [Greek] lands, while in their place, now, the Armenians have settled."

In his French translation of this passage ("Bibl. Geog. Arab.," vi, p. 176), Professor De Goeje tentatively proposed the reading "Naylakāni" or "Naykalāni," that is *Nicholaeans*, for Baylakāni, *Paulicians*, the MSS. being here corrupt, and the letters *n* and *b* in Arabic only differing by the position of a diacritical point. I have Professor De Goeje's authority, however, for stating that Baylakāni is without doubt the true reading.

From the above it follows that Abriḳ, capital of the Paulicians, as described by Arab geographers, is undoubtedly the place which the Byzantine authors call Tephrikē; and as this last is represented by the modern Divrigi, or Divrik, on the Tchalta Irmak, the Arab Castle of Abriḳ and the river of the same name must be respectively Divrik and the Tchalta river, and *not* the fortress of Arabkir, which stands on the Saritchitchek Su, many miles to the south.

It of course follows that the tributary of the Abriḳ

called the river Zamra (or Zimara, as our MS. of Ibn Serapion also spells the name) cannot be either the Miram Tchay or the Kistek Tchay, which joins the Saritchitchek Su (see J.R.A.S. 1895, pp. 65 and 744). Zamra must have been the name of one of the tributaries of the Tchalta Irmak (Abriḳ river), which joined that stream below Divrigi, for Ibn Serapion writes that "it falls into the river Abriḳ a little below the Castle of Abriḳ" (*loc. cit.*, p. 63). This identification is certainly favoured by the fact that at the present day a village called Zimarra<sup>1</sup> still exists near here. Mr. Vincent W. Yorke, who has recently returned from a journey through this country of the upper waters of the Euphrates, informs me that the present Zimarra Su is a tributary of the Euphrates, and joins the great river a short way above the mouth of the Tchalta Irmak. The Zimarra Su does not, therefore, fit the case of the Zamra river, as described by Ibn Serapion; which last must have been one of the streams marked (but not named) in Kiepert's Map, which are left-bank tributaries of the Tchalta Irmak, flowing in from the country near Zimarra village.

Coming to the river Lūḳiya, which in note 4 to p. 57 of my paper on Ibn Serapion was wrongly identified with the Tchalta Irmak (the Tchalta being undoubtedly the Abriḳ river), this Lūḳiya most probably is one of the two important streams which join the right bank of the Euphrates a little above the junction of the Tchalta. These streams are not named in Kiepert's Map, but Mr. Yorke writes that they are both of considerable volume, being called respectively the Armidan Tchay and the Kara Budak. One of them must be the Lūḳiya aforesaid, and on it lay the "single fortress" mentioned on p. 54 of my paper.

The next right-bank tributary of the Euphrates, the Nahr Anjā, I now believe to be identical with the river called the Saritchitchek Su,<sup>2</sup> wrongly identified (*loc. cit.*, p. 58)

<sup>1</sup> Also Zimara is the name of a station mentioned in the Peutinger Tables, the Antonine Itinerary, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Still called Angu Tchay near its mouth, according to Mr. Yorke.

with the Abriḳ river. In the former list of identifications, the river Anjā could only come in as either the short stream on which stands the village of Tchermuk (*loc. cit.*, p. 58) or its neighbour, the Soyut Tchay (*idem*, p. 744). Neither of these, however, correspond with the description given by Ibn Serapion of the course of the Anjā, which "rises in the mountain of Abriḳ, a little way above the crossing the high-road from Malatiyya" (*loc. cit.*, p. 54). The "high-road" here mentioned must mean the Great Road going from Melitene westwards into the Greek Country (the ancient High-road to Constantinople); and the important stream of the Anjā—described as flowing down "between mountains," exactly corresponds with the course of the river now known as the Saritchitchek Su, which rises far to the westward, and on whose banks stands the modern capital of the district, Arabkir. It may be noted in passing that Arabkir is apparently mentioned by none of the mediaeval Arab geographers. It is called Nareen in the old Turkish fiscal Archives, as is recorded by Taylor (see *J. R. Geogr. Society*, xxxviii, page 311).

The only point against the identification of the Anjā with the Saritchitchek Su, is the statement made in Ibn Serapion that the Anjā joined the Euphrates "at a distance five leagues *below the mouth of the river Arsanās*" (p. 54). But the Arabic MS. is here defective; "Arsanās" is written "Asnās," and I now believe this may be a clerical error for "Abriḳ," a word with which it might easily be confounded in the Arabic writing. In the loose way in which Ibn Serapion counts distances, the Anjā (Saritchitchek Su) might well be described as flowing into the Euphrates "five leagues below the Nahr Abriḳ," that is to say, a little way *above* the junction of the Murād Tchay or Arsanās river. If "Abriḳ" for "Arsanās" be deemed too bold an emendation, the facts of the case will be equally suited by changing the adverb "below" into "above" (and read *fauc̣* in the Arabic text of Ibn Serapion, p. 11, line 5 from below, in place of *asfal*), but the distance of "five leagues *above* the mouth of the Nahr Arsanās" for the incoming of the Anjā



river is only approximately correct for describing the mouth of the Saritchitchek Su.

In a tabular form the identifications now proposed for the right-bank (western) tributaries of the Upper Euphrates are as follows, beginning above and working down stream :—

(I) Lūḫiya (river)	is either the Kara Budak or the Armi-dan Tchay,	<i>not</i> the Tchalta Irmak (p. 57, note 2).
(II) Abriḫ (river and town)	is the Tchalta Irmak and the town of Divrik (Tephrikē),	<i>not</i> the Saritchitchek Su (p. 58, note 3), and <i>not</i> Arabkir (p. 740).
(IIa) Zamra (river)	is an affluent of the Tchalta Irmak,	<i>not</i> the Miram Tchay (p. 65, note 2), <i>nor</i> the Kiztek Tchay (p. 744).
(III) Anjā (river)	is the Saritchitchek Su,	<i>not</i> the stream of the Tchermuk village (p. 58, note 3), <i>nor</i> the Soyut Tchay (p. 744).

As showing that Tephrikē also among the Byzantines bore a name very like Abriḫ, it is to be noticed that the Greek MSS. of two of their Chronicles give, as a variant for Tephrikē, the name Aphrikē (*Τεφρική*, variant *Ἀφρική*). My attention was first called to this passage by Mr. Yorke, who has also pointed out to me that the name of the Zarnūḫ river, a tributary of the Kūbākib, which flows into the Euphrates near Malaṭiyya (Melitene), is mentioned in the Byzantine Chronicles under the forms *Ζαρνούχ* and *Ἀτζαρνούκ*, which, seeing that *n* and *b* are unlikely to be substituted for one another in the Greek letters, disposes of the alternative form, given in the MS. of Ibn Serapion, of "Zarbūk" (*loc. cit.*, p. 743).

What, however, may be gleaned on this and kindred subjects from the Byzantine Chronicles has recently been ably discussed in the pages of the *Classical Review* (for April, 1896), in a most interesting article entitled "The

Campaign of Basil I against the Paulicians in 872 A.D.," by Mr. J. G. C. Anderson, of the University of Aberdeen, to whom (and Professor Ramsay) I am indebted for much valuable information. In the course of his discussion of the various Byzantine accounts of the campaign of Basil I against the Paulicians, Mr. Anderson shows that the river *Ḳarāḳis*, described by Ibn Serapion, is also almost certainly mentioned by the Byzantines. Readers of this Journal who take an interest in the mediaeval geography of Asia Minor, and the question of the frontier fortresses lying between the Greeks and the Saracens, may be referred to this paper, where a solution is offered of the thorny question as to the true sites of *Zibaṭra* and *Hadath*.

There can be no doubt that *Zibaṭra* of the Moslems is identical with the fortress called either *Zapetra* or *Sozopetra* by the Byzantine Chroniclers, for the story of its capture by the Emperor Theophilus, and its recapture by the Caliph Mu'taṣim during his celebrated expedition against Amorium, is narrated alike by both the Greek and the Arab annalists (compare Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," vi, 413, with Weil, "Geschichte der Chalifen," ii, 309). The question remains as to the situation of *Zibaṭra*, which neither the Greeks nor the Arabs very accurately describe. What the latter have recorded will be found in my notes to Ibn Serapion (p. 66), while the Greek authorities have now been examined by Mr. Anderson, and the results will be found in his paper above referred to.

It may be mentioned, however, as supporting the view that *Zibaṭra* must be sought at the present *Virān-Shahr* on the Sultan Su (and this was my first identification, which Mr. Anderson confirms by what is stated in the Byzantine Chronicles) and *not* at *Derendeh* (as is one of the suggestions offered by Mr. Hogarth: see Ibn Serapion, p. 745), that *Derendeh* is itself mentioned, under the form *Ṭarandah*, by the contemporary Arab authorities. *Balādhuri* (p. 185, and he is copied by *Ibn-al-Athīr* and *Yāḳūt*) states that *Ṭarandah*, which lay three marches distance from *Malaṭiyya*, deep in the Greek

country, was garrisoned by the Moslems after A.H. 83 (702), but was subsequently abandoned by orders of the Caliph Omar II in A.H. 100 (719). Zibaṭra, therefore, cannot have been identical with Ṭarandah, which is another place. Mr. Anderson, also, gives us references to the Byzantine Chronicles proving that *Taranta* was a Paulician stronghold, and there is no reason to doubt the identification of Byzantine "Taranta," Arab "Ṭaranda," and the modern Derendeh, which lies high up on the Tokhma Sū.

Further, in confirmation of the view adopted by Mr. Anderson and Professor Ramsay that the site of Ḥadath must be sought at or near the modern Inekli, on the Ak-Su, may be mentioned the statement found in the Geographical Dictionary of Bakri (p. 657). In the article on 'Arbasūs (Arabissos, Al-Bustan) the author describes this as a city of the Greeks lying "over against" or "opposite" Ḥadath, thus leading us to infer that Ḥadath (a place doubtless well known to him) was on the nearer and Moslem side of Arabissos, and to the south of that city.

In conclusion, I venture to point out that the historical geography of Asia Minor is likely to gain a yet firmer basis, if the accounts of the Byzantine annalists be systematically compared with, and a corrective applied from, the works of the contemporary Arab geographers.

---